

III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 8, 14 and 20 are amended. Claims 26-29 are new. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

2. Claim 1 is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

3. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 20 and 22-25 are not anticipated by Boss et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,758,110 ("Boss") under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Claim 1 recites that visual information produced by one or more applications is displayed on a display of the first terminal. At least one user defined selection area on the display of the first terminal is defined independently of the application area and the user defined selection area contains information on the one or more application areas. The information contained in the user defined selection area is transmitted to and displayed on the second terminal. The information displayed on the second terminal is not visually restricted. Boss does not disclose or suggest these features.

The user in Boss cannot define the area displayed on the client system (11) that is not already predefined by the system to contain only information pertaining to a specific shared application, as the display in Boss is application specific (i.e. only the shared application is displayed on the client system) (Col. 7, L. 54-67). In Boss, unlike the Applicant's invention, the areas are already predefined.

Boss discloses a task based application sharing method in which both the host and the client user share control of the host system (14). The host and client user share control of one or

more applications which the host user has selected to share. In Boss, a sensor application (107) determines whether or not the current task is "part of a shared application". If the current task is not "part of the shared application", the sensor application (107) continues to monitor graphical interface device (102) for each call graphical interface (102) makes to display driver (104) (Col. 5, L. 24-32). Thus, the information contained in the shared application window of Boss is predefined by the system and not the user. In Applicant's invention, the user is not restricted in selecting the areas to be shared. If the current task in Boss is not "part of a shared application" it is not displayed on the client system (11) (Col. 5, L. 24-45). There is simply no ability for the user of the system in Boss to define an area that is not already predefined to contain only information pertaining to a specific shared application.

Boss discloses that the shared applications are displayed within the shared corresponding rectangular area (16) on the client system (11) (Col. 4, L. 18-25). Figure 8 of Boss discloses that a transparent hatch represents an overlapping window of a non-shared application on a window of a shared application (Col. 7, L. 54 - Col. 8, L. 3). This means that the user of the client system (11) can notice the hatching (i.e. that the window is partially overlapped by another window) while allowing the user of the client system (11) to read the portion of the shared application that is overlapped by the non-shared application (Col. 7, L. 65-67).

This transparent hatching of non-shared applications within the shared application window emphasizes the application dependent system of Boss and the inability of the user in Boss to define an area on the display of the host system in such a way that all

the information inside that area is shown on the display of the client system irrespective of the contents contained in that area (Col. 7, L. 65-67). This is unlike what is claimed in Applicant's claim 1. Claim 1 calls for at least one user defined selection area on the display of the first terminal being transmitted for display on the second terminal. The user defined selection area, as called for in claim 1, is defined independently of the application area wherein the user defined selection area contains at least information on one or more application areas, the display of the information on the second terminal being visually unrestricted. If Boss were not application dependent the user of Boss would be able to see the contents of the hatched area that overlaps the shared application. In Boss, the user cannot define an area on the display of the host system (14) so that all the information inside that area is shown on the display of the client system (11) irrespective of the contents contained in that area, as further evidenced by the hatching of non-shared information within the window of a shared application (Col. 7, L. 54-67). The area or window definition of Boss is always tied to the shared application and cannot be altered by the user of the host system (14) or by the user of the client system (11).

The client system in Boss only displays the information contained in the shared application's window and no other information (Fig. 2). Again, this is not what is claimed in Applicant's claim 1. Claim 1 calls for a user defining a selection area independent of an application area where the selection area contains at least information on the one or more application areas, the display of the information on the second terminal being visually unrestricted. In the system of the Applicant's invention, the user of the first device can define a

free-form area irrespective of what kind of information is included inside the area. There can be several windows of different applications inside the area, wherein all the information of those windows (or those parts of the windows that are inside the user defined area) is transmitted to a second device in which the information is displayed.

Although Boss also discloses that the shared application windows can be sized and resized when the host user manipulates the windows (Col.6, L. 7-10), the application specific information within the resized window of Boss remains the same (i.e. no additional information is added to the shared application information). As discussed above, non-shared applications will still be represented as a transparent hatch that exists on top of the shared application window. This however, is not the same as a user defining a selection area that is independent of the application area that contains at least information on one or more application areas as called for in claim 1.

No matter which way the user in Boss resizes the window, only the contents of the shared task will be shown in that window. There is no ability in Boss to create a selection area on the display of the host system so that an area that is defined independently of the application window is displayed on the client system as called for in Applicant's claim 1. In Boss, the host designates an "application to be shared". The host or user does not define a user selected area independent of the application window or shared task (Col. 2, L. 34-45). Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Boss as Boss fails to disclose or suggest at least one user defined selection area that is defined independently of the application area and includes at least

information on one or more application areas as claimed by Applicant.


Independent claims 8, 14 and 20 are patentable over Boss for reasons similar to those discussed above. Claims 2-12, 15-18 and 22-25 are patentable over Boss by reason of their respective dependencies.

4. Claims 13, 19 and 21 are patentable over Boss in view of Hawkins et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,343,318 ("Hawkins"). For the reasons discussed above, Boss fails to disclose or suggest at least one user defined selection area that is defined independently of the application area and includes at least information on one or more application areas as called for in independent claims 8, 14 and 20. Because Boss fails to disclose or suggest the features of Applicant's independent claims, the combination of Boss and Hawkins cannot either. Therefore, dependent claims 13, 19 and 21 are patentable over the Boss in view of Hawkins by reason of their respective dependencies.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check in the amount of \$1,910.00 is enclosed for a three month extension of time, additional claim and RCE fees. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.

Reg. No. 44,004

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512

15 September 2005

Date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below, as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: Sept. 15, 2005

Signature: Meaghan Bayle
Person Making Deposit